

Appendix B Riverhead Consultation & Response
(13 October 2007 Open Day)

Feedback	Response	Discussion / Explanation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commercial centre by petrol station, should be zoned commercial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Petrol station now shown as 'retail / commercial'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will need changes to District plan to take effect.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to finalise wastewater system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council is investigating. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major LTCCP / budget issue for Council determination
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Don't "condense" existing village, or overload open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Density in existing village shown as 800m² lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New areas need to provide own open space, not rely on existing - shown on plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keep section size in existing village to 800m². 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As per Variation 60. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed Council variation in progress.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need long term plan for transport and short term improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requires Council / ARTA investigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Separate Council initiative.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of northern urban area flood prone (limit zoning). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of zoning modified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required technical investigation prior to future rezoning.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Walkways in village and along river. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indicative walkways now illustrated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Precise alignments to be defined by Council/RRRA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer scenario 3 (town triangle). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modified version of Option 3 proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed plan reflects diverse input and investigations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on school / need for second school / playing fields. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requires further Council lobbying of Ministry of Education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minister of Education contacted. ▪ Playing fields part of RDC open space strategy and land acquisition.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for professional officer and mixed use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed use zone retained, town centre reconfigured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both town centre and mixed use area should allow for offices.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historic sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Included in District Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More detailed study of future urban areas recommended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Children's play areas and kindergarten. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finer level of detail than structure plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council to consider as part of open space plan / Reserve Management plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design guidelines "a must". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed, supported throughout consultation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To be built into future Plan Change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited comprehensive development - strict controls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To be built into future Plan Change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce or eliminate mixed use development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have a reduced scale and modified location of mixed use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific controls subject to Plan Change process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too much commercial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As above, commercial footprint reduced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subject to Plan Change process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less abrupt density transitions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diagram modified in response, eg 800m² sections both sides of Kaipara Portage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Higher density (600m²) sections around major open space in urban south area only.

Appendix B Riverhead Consultation & Response
(13 October 2007 Open Day)

Feedback	Response	Discussion / Explanation
	Road.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic calming measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finer level of detail than Structure Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To be considered as part of RDC transportation plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Town centre should be the 'mixed use' zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Now shown on diagram. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggest retaining distinction between town centre (including retail) and mixed use zone.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide road access to all sections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finer level of detail than Structure Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connecting all roads not feasible, or cost effective.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid showing "open space" on private properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diagram modified in some instances. ▪ Wording reflects need for land negotiations and/or, consent process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private property rights cannot be modified by Structure Plan. ▪ Established process and safeguards built into land acquisition process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Back to basics" - need footpaths, lighting and sewage system first. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council Annual Plan / LTCCP issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to local ratepayers and RRRA, to engage in Annual Plan process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No sewage system - "fine as it is." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minority opinion (from consultation results). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engage in LTCCP process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extend esplanade reserve and walkway along Wautaiti Stream. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Now proposed on plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council verification of stream status and esplanade reserve required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide bridle paths. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finer level of detail than Structure Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council to consider as part of Open Space Strategy / Reserve Management Plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coastal properties along Sussex Street not feasible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diagrammatic only, existing titles and subdivision pattern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This will depend on need / feasibility of vesting esplanade reserve.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High density conflicts with existing character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing village shown at minimum 800m² lot size. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build design guidelines / criteria into any future plan changes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider more density in future 'urban north' so children don't have to cross highway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of 'Residential A' (800m² min. site size), reduced as a result of other feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for second school and / or improved pedestrian crossings recommended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need for periodic review of structure plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggest plan be reviewed at 5 year periods.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed slip roads "too expensive and little benefit." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of slip roads reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is a proven technique for addressing both traffic and rural character issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about southern 'Future Urban' - disconnected, too 'suburban'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Connections shown in diagram. ▪ Relates to comments re: Design Guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to include urban design guidelines / criteria in Plan Change. ▪ Exact layout is

Appendix B Riverhead Consultation & Response
(13 October 2007 Open Day)

Feedback	Response	Discussion / Explanation
		determined at subdivision stage (and possible notification)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Eliminate 600m² lots and introduce 1000m² lots. (Some larger 1200m² lots good)." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ability to create 600m² in defined areas retained. ▪ Min. 1000m² lots introduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 600m² lots internalised in southern urban area: should not affect existing village. ▪ Subject to Plan Change public process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keep commercial / town centre to one side of highway (no retail west of highway). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minority opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See plan for recommended configuration.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support cafes on riverfront / reserves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shown as "tourist commercial" on diagram. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subject to Plan Change process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ramp or wharf at end of Dinning Road? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finer level of detail than structure plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider in future Reserve Management Plans.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at future land acquisition for playing fields 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree, but outside town limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Part of LTCCP process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too much open space for small population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minority opinion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No action recommended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transport park and ride needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include as part of Council / ARTA transport study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Separate study, but not supported.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30m esplanade strips along all waterways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contrary to current Council policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not supported.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reposition roads shown in 'urban north' area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Road pattern modified, simplified and labelled as "indicative". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Urban north road pulled back to coincide with current town boundary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "It's all about time". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N/A